

17th March 1931]

Inspector again warned the processionists to disperse; they refused to disperse and the Inspector thereon dispersed them with force.

- (c) The Government have no information as to the number of persons who may have been injured during the course of the dispersal. No person was, so far as their information goes, seriously injured.
- (d) It was reported by the District Magistrate that a Muhammadan boy (age unknown) was knocked down during the course of the dispersal and sustained an injury to the head. He was at once removed to the hospital and so far as Government are aware is not in a precarious condition.
- (e) None.
- (f) The Government have given such information as they have from the report of the District Magistrate made soon after the incident occurred.

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT:—"May I know, Sir, as to whether the responsibility of the police ceases with the beating?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"May I once again suggest, Sir, that we may let bygones be bygones, especially after the settlement between the Government and the Congress. I may say that I shall try to give such information as I have got on these matters, but I think it would be better that both the Government and the Opposition should now turn their attention to the constructive work in regard to the future constitution of India."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"May I know, Sir, in view of the reply that has just been given by the hon. the Home Member, whether the Government of India is not going into the question of excesses on the part of the police? It may be that the Local Government may have to answer questions on the subject, and so these facts may be brought out, and then it will be opportune enough to adopt the suggestion."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"That question has been answered by the Government of India already."

Alleged lathi charge at Udipi on 26th January 1931.

* 626 Q.—Mr. A. B. SHETTY: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) what the number of the reserve police who were taken to Udipi on the night of the 26th January was, how long they were kept there and for what purpose; and

(b) whether any enquiry has been made regarding the necessity for the use of lathi that day and the circumstances connected with the beating of the Muhammadan boy who got mixed up in the crowd of on-lookers?

A.—(a) The Government are aware that the District Superintendent of Police had to despatch a body of the reserve police to Udipi as a precaution against breaches of the peace. There is however no information as to the strength of the force or as to how long it was kept in Udipi.

[17th March 1931]

- (b) The Government are satisfied that the police acted with great restraint on the occasion in question and that force was only employed against those taking part in a banned procession. A Mappilla boy was knocked down as the processionists were in flight, and was not beaten by the police as alleged.

Alleged prevention by the police of the general body meeting of the Ramachandrapuram Club and Reading Room.

* 627 Q.—Mr. K. KOTI REDDI: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Secretaries of Ramachandrapuram Club and Reading Room, East Godavari district, were informed by police officials that the general body meeting that was announced to take place at 5 p.m. on 25th January 1931 in the club premises could only be held if the members were prepared to be dispersed by the use of lathis;

(b) whether it is a fact that on refusal of certain members of the club playing cards to leave the club when asked to do so by a head constable in mufti, the head constable left the club and returned with a reserve constable armed with a lathi and then asked them to leave the club; and

(c) what were the circumstances which led the police to act in that manner and under what provision of law or authority they so acted?

A.—(a) No.

(b) The answer is in the negative. There being reason to suppose that anti-Government measures would be discussed at the meeting, a head constable in mufti was asked to attend and report what took place. He did not take the action ascribed to him.

(c) Does not arise.

Prevention of a business meeting of the Ramachandrapuram Club.

* 628 Q.—Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state whether he has received a petition from Mr. B. Venkataratnam, ex-M.L.C., Vice-President, Ramachandrapuram Club and Reading Room, in which he stated that the police stopped a business meeting of the members of the club, on the 25th January last and if so, what action has been taken on it?

A.—Yes. The Government have obtained a report from the District Magistrate of East Godavari and the answer to question No. 627, to which the hon. Member is referred, is based upon that report. No further action is proposed to be taken on Mr. Venkataratnam's petition.

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"May I know, Sir, whether the hon. the Home Member expresses regret with regard to this question also?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"I never expressed regret or any such thing. All that I said was, it is not worth while now pursuing these questions in view of the settlement between the Government and the Congress."